DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 086 047 HE 004 946

AUTHOR Curl, Sam E.
TITLE University Planning: Who Needs It?
PUB DATE [73]
NOTE 37p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *College Planning; *Educational Objectives; *Educational Planning; Essays; *Higher Education; *Resource Allocations; Universities

ABSTRACT

In order for the university to regain public confidence and survive as a vital force that makes decisions relevant to the problems of today and tomorrow, it has no alternative but to reexamine with commitment its purpose for being as well as to identify, clarify, and articulate its mission, goals, and objectives in order to chart its own course and forecast an explicit design for the future. It must continually assess its strengths and weaknesses, evaluate existing practices and restraints, anticipate future trends and evaluate alternative courses of action, formulate board strategies and specific programs for achieving its goals, and determine its priorities. Planning with flexibility for the effective allocation of scarce resources, to include elimination of its activities and expenditures that are inefficient, unproductive, and do not contribute to the realization of its goals, has become an essential university function. The institution should establish and maintain a well-balanced posture with respect to autonomy and accountability, incorporate validated management practices to their optimum advantage while retaining a clear vision of the academic goals of the institution, move consistently toward its goals, and commit itself to a continuous program of self-evaluation and renewal. (Author)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 086047

UNIVERSITY PLANNING: WHO NEEDS IT?

Sam E. Curl
Fellow, American Council on Education
Academic Administration Internship Program
1972-73

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 004 946

PREFACE

This paper was prepared during the author's participation as a Fellow in the American Council on Education Academic Administration Internship Program in the 1972-73 academic year. The author, while on leave from his regular duties as Associate Dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences at Texas Tech University, served his internship at Oklahoma State University under the guidance and direction of President Robert B. Kamm.

The feeling of the author and that of President Kamm and other administrative officials at Oklahoma State University concerning the necessity for institutional planning provided the impetus for a report of this nature.

A portion of the paper is based on the author's experience during the internship year as a member of the steering committee of the President's Planning Council at Oklahoma State University.

Although many of the same basic principles are applicable to statewide and regional planning agencies, the report addresses itself only to institutional planning and its problems. Programming strategies, i.e., MIS, PPBS, and other technical aspects of planning developed from systems analysis are not described in this paper, but are the subject of a number of recent higher education research reports.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author wishes to express his gratitude to President Robert B. Kamm, to the other members of the President's Planning Council, and to Dr. James W. Richardson, Professor Emeritus of Higher Education, for their counsel and suggestions during the preparation of this paper.

For making possible an administrative internship experience of inestimable worth, the author is deeply indebted to Texas Tech University, Oklahoma State University, and the American Council on Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE. ii

ACKNOWLEDGMENT. iii

INTRODUCTION. 1

REVIEW OF LITERATURE. 2

The Monetary Crisis in American Higher Education. 2

The Call for Change. 3

The University's Only Alternative: Plan. 4

Charting the Course. 6

Who Sets the Goals?. 8

The Planning Process. 10

PLANNING AT OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY. 13

OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS. 24

LIST OF REFERENCES

UNIVERSITY PLANNING: WHO NEEDS IT?

Sam E. Curl

There is general agreement in the American academic community that planning for the future is a proper and necessary function of the modern university. Although concepts of what university planning should involve vary greatly among institutions and individuals, there is undoubtedly resounding consensus that "planning is a good thing." For years, all colleges and universities have been engaged in some form of "planning."

Loss of needed income through stabilization or reduction of levels of public financial support and student enrollment, combined with rising educational costs, can be expected to seriously hamper the efforts of many academic institutions to develop new programs, hire new faculty, construct new physical facilities, or even maintain present levels during the next decade.

Although this paper emphasizes the necessity for institutional planning in order to efficiently allocate scarce financial resources, the "blank spots" responsible for a decline of public confidence in higher education must be identified and dealt with in order to resolve the funding problem. The author does not wish to imply that an unexpected wave of state, federal, or private funding would immediately resolve all of the major problems confronting higher education. Symptoms of a deeper, more obscure problem, such as an apparent decline of morale and "esprit de corps" on the part of many faculty members, accompanied by a tendency to transfer loyalties from the institution to the department or discipline, were apparent in the 1960's while higher education was enjoying a much more favorable priority rating on the funding scale.

Planning is much easier said than done. Effective planning requires hard work and important decisions. The contemporary university's need for commitment to a continuous planning process in order to achieve renewal through purpose and direction is crucial.

THE MONETARY CRISIS IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

In financial terms, the period from 1957 to 1967 was American education's golden decade (Smith, 1971). Because of its affluence, generated as a result of expanding national economy and increased public support, higher education was able to survive and even prosper in spite of inefficiency. Eurich and Tickton (1972), in their assessment of the financial status of colleges and universities during the period from 1955 to 1970, indicated that because it was usually possible to increase income and thereby cover costs, the need to set priorities or choose between alternatives was not critical.

The late 1960's brought evidence that higher education was in a state of financial distress (Smith, 1971). A number of factors, including inflation, student unrest, a tight federal and state budget situation, the dip in the stock market, unemployment, and a surplus of Ph.D.'s and highly trained engineers and scientists (Eurich and Tickton, 1972), as well as a general wavering of public confidence, had begun to exert new pressures on the status and outlook for the future of higher education. Cheit (1971) reported that, of 41 divergent types of higher education institutions studied, 71 percent were either in financial trouble or "headed for trouble." Jellema (1971), in a report relating to the financial posture of the U. S. private colleges, drew similar conclusions.

Cheit (1971) and Perkins (1970) have studied the critical situation resulting from the rising costs of education coupled with the declining rate of increase in funding. Perkins (1970) indicated that the disparity in the relative annual growth of educational costs (10 percent) and Gross National Product (3 to 4 percent) could not be expected to long continue.

THE CALL FOR CHANGE

Reinert (1972) cautioned that any institution that continues with the standard of living it has enjoyed during the past decade is "on a collision course with disaster." In observing that cost consciousness must become a way of life for both administrators and faculty, Reinert further indicated that administrators "must decide what wood is dead where services, courses, programs, activities, operations, and positions are concerned, and then prune." Brown (1970) emphasized the necessity for immediate elimination of university programs that are ineffective, inefficient, and unproductive, and outlined procedures for implementing such cutbacks. Drucker (1972), suggesting that governments, hospitals and universities find it very difficult to "get rid of yesterday," indicated that "no organization which purposefully and systematically abandons the unproductive and obsolete ever wants for opportunities." Drucker added that decisions about what to abandon must be based on informed judgments, and that they are the most important and most often neglected decisions in goal setting of organizations.

Besse (1972), in referring to the financial crisis in higher education and drawing a number of comparisons between the management of universities and that of business corporations, suggested that the transferability of validated business practices to university management should be examined. Bolton and Genck (1971), indicating that university management requirements have expanded dramatically in recent years, emphasized that limited attention

to management underlies many of the serious difficulties confronting higher education today.

Oswald (1973) recently stated that retrenchment and reallocation are the absolute necessities that affect fiscal, program, and planning decisions in the seventies. Change, according to the National Laboratory for Higher Education (1972), should be based on the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data about the institution and its constituents, rather than "on the intuition of any individual or group, however brilliant or perceptive." Dobbins (1971) cautioned that although higher education cannot and should not escape major revision and adjustment, "many changes which are brought about by those who support change as an end in itself will probably be short-lived."

Henry (1972) suggested that the present demands upon higher education for accountability "can be turned into an opportunity for renewed concern with institutional interpretation" and that higher education's proper response to this challenge "will go a long way toward restoring confidence in the system and increasing the priority now assigned."

THE UNIVERSITY'S ONLY ALTERNATIVE: PLAN

Planning for the effective allocation of scarce resources is an inevitable course of action for American higher education as it moves through the seventies and into the next decade. Wilson (1971) indicated that "higher education as a whole has lagged in the development and application of systematic knowledge about its own processes." Many administrators, as a result of being so fully occupied with their own day-to-day pressures and unique responsibilities that they often lose sight of the common goals and total thrust of their institutions (Winstead and Hobson, 1971), tend to meet crisis after crisis, putting out one "brushfire" after another (Bolin, 1969). Dobbins (1972b) recently referred to the

"confusion in direction and philosophy" which exists in higher education today. Chase (1969) stated that educational planning has tended to sporadic, piecemeal, and confined to relatively tangible, i.e., providing facilities, aspects of education. A trustee of a prominent American university (Bellows, 1971) has indicated, "Managing change requires more than opposing drift. It means institutional planning."

Casasco (1970) reported that orderly growth and efficient resource allocation in universities require a systematic and coherent way of planning ahead, by envisioning the scope and direction of institutional development. Eurich and Tickton (1972) pointed out that university administrators need a plan which measures the adequacy of key decisions, keeps the institution on a course of action even in the midst of difficult and often unpopular decisions that the plan dictates, and has the flexibility to permit the institution to readily change its course if new conditions warrant. Neff (1971) emphasized that university planning in the future will require vision and commitment as well as technique. University planning must be of a qualitative as well as quantitative nature, with due consideration of the social and academic aspirations as well as the economic, i.e., budgetary, aspects of the institution (Williams, 1966; Palola et al., 1971; Eurich and Tickton, 1972). Chase (1969) indicated that educational planning must involve forecasting, or the assessment of probabilities, and consideration of alternative ways of dealing with anticipated contingencies.

University planning has been defined as:

> the process by which a university defines its overall goals and specific objectives and devises the means of attaining them (Casasco, 1970).

> a process whereby an institution defines its philosophy and mission, establishes goals in keeping with that philosophy, devises programs to attain the goals, marshalls its resources behind the programs, and evaluates the results (Salmon et al., cited by Harvey, 1971).

> an attempt to deal with a somewhat uncertain future by establishing specific objectives, gathering data to quantify those objectives, and using this information to formulate broad strategies and specific programs which are based on alternative ways of attaining objectives (Smith, 1969).
>
> an attempt to develop an explicit design for the future which will organize the variables which must be dealt with into some coherent pattern and which, when organized, will provide a structured frame-of-reference within which future decisions can be made more effectively (Smith, 1969).
>
> an operation which provides the raw material for decisions in terms of clearly formulated priority choices and alternative lines of action, their implications worked out and explicity stated (Eide, 1969).
>
> the means which administrators can use to build a more effective educational program through the development of a coherent and consistent interrelationship among the diverse units of an institution (Bolin, 1969).

Harvey (1971) suggested that the major benefit of planning is not that it specifies projections or programs, but that it clarifies goals, assesses strengths and weaknesses of the institution, and evaluates alternatives. Citing the report of Smith, Harvey (1971) has listed the following as other advantages of institutional planning:

> (1) Planning aids in the allocation of resources among competing demands.
>
> (2) Potential supporting agencies, i.e., government, foundations, will support those institutions with the best defined missions.
>
> (3) Controlled development is preferable to the aimless drifting from crisis to crisis which has characterized higher education in the past.
>
> (4) Defining specific missions will maintain the diversity that has traditionally characterized American higher education.

CHARTING THE COURSE

Institutional change should be a planned, continuous process carried out in an

orderly, non-disruptive manner on the basis of comprehensive and coordinated goals and objectives (National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1972). Winstead and Hobson (1971) indicated that universities need clear and explicit goal statements to provide necessary focus and direction, measurable objectives derived from these goals, and administrative emphasis on management to attain these objectives, and stated that only then will institutions be able to maintain their autonomy and integrity and move consistently toward their chosen goals. Drucker (1972) emphasized that although "goals, once stated, become speedily obsolete, they must be forthcoming or resources will be wasted, and no means for measuring output will be available." Henry (1972) stressed the need for a clear-cut, specific statement of purposes in order to make measurement of performance meaningful. Babbidge (1965) indicated that what institutions need most as a result of planning is not the plan itself, but " a clear set of goals, a sense of strategy and spirit in the institution's approach to these goals, and resources with which to monitor institutional activities, including sufficiently strong and sensitive leadership to insure that goals remain the litmus of every action."

Gould (1968) indicated that higher education institutions have often not made clear what their pathways are to be, that they have frequently taken refuge in broad, platitudinous statements of objectives, that they have then compounded their error by doing little to fortify these statements with specific programs that show that they mean what they say, and that they have rarely reexamined their goals in light of the needs of contemporary society. Neff (1971) predicted the doom of decision-making based on unexamined assumptions about purpose, process, and organization. Cullen (1971) stated that each institution should forecast the characteristic of the future society it is educating for and then debate the usefulness of existing practices and restraints, clearly state the purposes of the university,

eliminate activities and expenditures which do not contribute to the realization of these purposes, design processes for achieving the purposes, and continually test and evaluate their effectiveness. In emphasizing the need for American colleges and universities to develop an understanding of the particular roles they wish to play in the shaping of future society, Gould (1970) stated that they must "do more than make piecemeal concessions to change and merely defend themselves. They must take the initiative; they must call together their keenest minds and their most humane souls to sit, probe, question, plan, discard, and replace until a new concept of the university merges: one which will better fit today's needs but will have its major thrust toward tomorrow."

Numerous other writers, including Wallis (1968), Wilson (1971), Neff (1971), Bolton and Genck (1971), Bowen (1972), Reinert (1972), Eurich and Tickton (1972), and Heyns (1973), have stressed the need for establishment of institutional goals.

WHO SETS THE GOALS?

The question of who decides what in the university community--particularly as it relates to selection of the basic goals and objectives of the institution--has been the subject of much academic and non-academic debate. Fellman (1968) observed that the larger the circle of decision-making, the greater the variety of opinions and desires and the more difficult the task of finding a consensus from "clashing views and competing wills."

Neff (1971) indicated that university goals should be expressions of the total institutional perspective rather than mere summaries of the desires of subgroups within the institution. Uhl (1971) stated that the university should adopt goals based upon the

expectations of its constituent groups, but noted that this is difficult since the groups differ so widely in their expectations of the university. Gross and Grambsch (1968) concluded that there is no consensus among either academic administrators or faculty on what the role and purposes of the modern university should be. Peterson (1970) noted that "the goal determination process must be regarded universally on campus as fair if the resulting goal structure is to have legitimacy." Reinert (1972) indicated that "effective reform can be achieved only by consensus, although vigorous and persuasive leadership is required."

Babbidge (1965) indicated that a principle purpose of planning is to insure that an institution retains a degree of control over its own destiny. Gould (1968) stressed that an institution should be the originator of whatever process is necessary to determine its own goals and that, thereafter, its actions should reflect in every possible way its efforts to reach them, that administration, faculty, students, and other constituencies should work together to select the institutional goals, and that through the interplay of the several contituencies, objectives should emerge. Gould acknowledged that there would never be full agreement on the objectives, but that there could be clarity as to what the institution intends to do once it has charted its course.

Perkins (1972) observed that as costs and importance of educational matters increase, decision-making tends to move up the heirarchial scale, and away from the educational institutions toward political structures. Eurich and Tickton (1972) suggested that the failure of college and university administrators to plan will only mean that someone else will do the planning for them. Henry (1972) emphasized that university planning should not be left to politics, internal or external, and indicated that planning "is not a democratic process," that "ideas and suggestions should come from all sides, but the analysis should rest in professional hands," and that "final judgments should be left to those who are responsible

for living with the results of their recommendations and for exercising their accountability to the broad public, rather than to external interest or minority groups or solely to faculty and students." Henry further stated that autonomy and accountability must assume a delicate balance "for both protection of the public interest and conservation of the efficiency of freedom so essential to effective scholarship, teaching, and service."

THE PLANNING PROCESS

Eurich and Tickton (1972) indicated that the essential first step in the university planning process is a commitment to planning by the president, the other key administrative officers, and the trustees, and pointed out the need for involvement of all segments of the university community in development of the plan. Neff (1971), in citing the earlier suggestion of Eurich (1968), indicated the need for a broadly representational university planning council to concern itself with reconciling educational philosophies, professional standards, academic community needs, and organizational atmospheres, and to strive for agreement on operational university goals. Harvey (1971) indicated that the planning process is focused on gaining an understanding of the interrelationships among various components of an institution and their relevance to the institution's purposes. University planning must be a continuous process (Browne, 1965; Reinert, 1972; Henry, 1972).

Bolin (1969) indicated that the basic components of an effective long-range institutional plan should include the following:

> (1) purposes of the plan, which define the scope of the planning process and provide the setting in which it will be initiated;
>
> (2) a set of assumptions on which the planning process will be based, formulated to represent the conditions under which the plan will be implemented;

(3) a functional definition of the institution's specific nature and purpose, to provide a solid foundation on which a plan may be based;

(4) a critical analysis of the institution's current status in relation to its stated purposes, and a description of trends that might be developing within it;

(5) a projection of conditions, accomplished by using empirical data that can be assembled in a logical manner;

(6) a realistic definition of objectives that touch all operational levels of the institution; and

(7) guidelines for evaluating and revising the plan.

Casasco (1970) and Eurich and Tickton (1972) have also provided general outlines for conduct of university planning. McHenry (1965) has presented an analysis of internal academic planning and its problems.

Institutional planning is not devoid of certain inherent dangers. Babbidge (1965), although fully endorsing the need for planning, suggested that the planning process may lost sight of its purpose in clarifying objectives, and be "suffocated by considerations of strategy and tactics," and that the plan, when developed, could become a "conservative, even stultifying influence" upon a university, i.e., "something to hide behind as protection against threatening innovation." Toepfer (1973) stated that efforts to plan and set uncomplicated university goals could become frustrated by the sheer burden of moving them through the machinery of governance. Eurich and Tickton (1972) indicated that too many administrators, after the task of preparing a plan is completed, relax, thinking the job is done. Perkins (1972) warned that plans, if too carefully drawn, could often offset their value by undue reduction of freedom, and emphasized that plans should be flexible enough to allow for the protection of vitality and sensitivity to changing conditions.

Looking to the future, Cartter (1970) stated, "We have lived so long in a period of growth that we are ill-prepared to adjust to the more stationary conditions of 1975-1985." Oswald (1973) indicated that the crucial problem confronting universities in the seventies centers around commitment to "grappling program review" to determine priorities and find new uses for old funds, and to seek new funds. Only through planning can academic institutions expect to come to terms with the financial, social, and political crises of our times (Eurich and Tickton, 1972). Winstead and Hobson (1971) emphasized that academic communities must rethink their fundamental purposes if they are to be revitalized. Higher education can gain nothing through self-pity (Hesburgh, 1972) because of the decline of public confidence and support, or by remaining on the defensive (Dobbins, 1972a). Instead, colleges and universities must vigorously move forward into the future with positive mechanisms and attitudes that facilitate continuous self-renewal (Heyns, 1973).

"If we don't plan for the future, we are certainly its victims" (Babbidge, 1965).

PLANNING AT OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

Oklahoma State University, as one of our nation's land grant institutions, is dedicated to the primacy of the threefold academic mission of instruction, research, and extension, or public service. In the land grant tradition Oklahoma State University strives to be "the people's university" by emphasizing the equality of educational opportunity, a regard for the student as a total individual, the combination of liberal and practical education, the necessity for citizenship training, and the idea of the university serving all people through the application of knowledge to their lives.

The program of planning currently in progress at Oklahoma State University had its origin in March, 1968, when a group of administrative officials met to discuss the University's need for long-range goals and objectives. In 1969, a Committee on Seminars in Administration appointed by President Robert B. Kamm recommended the establishment of a continuing series of management seminars for administrative officers of the University. The first of these was held for Deans, Vice Presidents, and other selected administrators at one of Oklahoma's state lodges in the spring of 1970. The group which met was the forerunner of what is now known as the President's Planning Council.

Beginning in the spring of 1970 and continuing into 1971, numerous meetings involving administrative officials of the University were held to provide in-service management training, including a study of the systems analysis approach to institutional planning, i.e., the Planning-Programming Budgeting System (PPBS), Management Information Systems (MIS). In this series of meetings, some of which featured presentations by visiting consultants, administrators also became familiar with the management-by-objectives concept, and addressed themselves to special university problems requiring attention.

University administrators began to focus their attention on long-range planning as a necessary function in order to remain relevant in contemporary society and as an essential process in the improvement of management efficiency. The need for establishment of institutional priorities had become particularly apparent. Administrative policies and procedures required careful analysis with respect to their contributions to overall faculty productivity and creativity.

Because the "brushfires" of day-to-day management had made the scheduling of planning sessions difficult, it became obvious that time for planning should be set aside and scheduled well in advance. The President's Planning Council was established in the spring of 1971, and planning had officially become an integral part of the University.

Scheduled meetings of the President's Planning Council during a typical twelve-month period include four to six two-hour meetings on the campus, three meetings at the president's home beginning by mid-afternoon and including dinner, with a work session afterward, and one two-to-three-day retreat at an off-campus location.

The President's Planning Council is composed of the following personnel:

President
Vice President for Academic Affairs (Instruction and Research)
Vice President for Extension
Vice President for University Relations and Development
Vice President for Business and Finance
Vice President for Student Services
Director, School of Technical Training, Okmulgee, and Vice President
Dean and Director, College of Agriculture and Agricultural Experiment Station
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
Dean, College of Business Administration
Dean, College of Education
Dean, College of Engineering
Dean, College of Home Economics
Dean, College of Veterinary Medicine
Dean of the Graduate College
Dean of Resident Instruction, College of Agriculture
Dean of Student Affairs
Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs and Director, Research Foundation

Registrar and Director of Admissions
University Librarian
Director of Institutional Studies, University Computing and Data Processing
Director of Educational Development
Executive Assistant to the President

Prior to the development of statements of University purpose and direction, the following definitions were adopted by the Planning Council:

Mission -- a broad philosophical statement of the major functions or purposes of the university in society.

Philosophical Guidelines (Planning Principles) -- assumptions and concepts that serve as frames of reference in guiding the development and evaluation of goals and objectives.

Goals -- general states or outcomes that are desired. They are matters of choice and reflect the value judgments of those responsible for the university. They may or may not be attainable within a given planning period.

Objectives -- subdivisions of goals. Their attainment is desired by a specified time, and they should be measurable.

Members of the Planning Council were asked by the President to "continuously assess and re-think the functions and responsibilities of the Oklahoma State University, in the light of its central concern for people, changes in society, trends and issues in higher education, and the democratic tradition of the University as a land-grant institution which seeks to serve the needs of society wherever such exists."

After considerable deliberation and careful analysis by the members of the Planning Council and their colleagues, and with recognition of the need for simplicity and clarity, the following tentative statements of the University mission, planning principles, and goals were developed:

Mission of the University

The mission of the Oklahoma State University is to provide an environment in which its constituents can discover, examine critically, preserve, and transmit knowledge, wisdom, and values that will help ensure the survival of present and future generations, with enrichment in the quality of life.

Planning Principles

1. The central concern of the university is people and what happens to them as human beings.

2. The university must be sensitive to the needs of society (e.g., social, cultural, and environmental), but must avoid being politicized.

3. The university is a part of a coordinated state system of higher education and must use its resources to maximize its unique contributions.

4. Limited institutional resources and the mission of the university require the establishment of priorities.

5. Effective governance and management of the university require the efficient use of resources in achieving goals, as well as the continuous evaluation of the worth and effectiveness of programs.

6. The welfare of the university as a whole must take precedence over the component parts; and the interdependence of the parts must be recognized and maintained.

7. Freedom of thought and expression responsibly exercised are recognized as essential in discipline areas and in the operation of the university.

Goals of the University

1. To transmit and preserve knowledge, wisdom, and values.

   (a) To encourage people to engage in learning activities on a regular, frequent, and lifelong basis.

   (b) To assist those who desire to learn, in an effort to improve the quality of their lives and the lives of others.

   (c) To aid students in their total development, including the cultivation of sound intellectual, social, moral, aesthetic, and physical potentials.

   (d) To encourage each student to use that which he learns in constructive ways that improve the well-being of self, family, friends, neighbors, colleagues, fellow citizens, and members of the community in which he lives.

(e) To provide for the storage and retrieval of accumulated knowledge.

2. To discover and examine critically knowledge, wisdom, and values.

(a) To identify worthy (relevant and important to society, faculty, and students) researchable problems (subject matter areas) about new knowledge which needs to be discovered and about old information which needs to be re-examined critically.

(b) To conduct quality research programs on such problems (either basic or applied research).

3. To inform the university's publics about the institution's educational goals, capabilities, and interests; and to secure resources to help the institution accomplish its goals.

4. To utilize the resources made available to the institution in such a way as to maximize the probability of succeeding in accomplishing the institution's goals.

After the development of University mission and goal statements had been completed, the members of the Planning Council were asked by the President to prepare statements of goals and objectives for their respective areas of responsibility. Management-type objectives pertaining to the broad primary functions of the University--teaching, research and extension--and to general support services were written by the Vice Presidents. Academic deans, with the assistance of inputs from their faculties, prepared statements of goals and objectives for their respective Colleges. Within each college, goals and objectives were written for each of the three primary functional categories. Each statement was compatible with the University statements, but was directly related to the specific programs of that college within the framework of the University. Similar statements were also prepared by the directors of support units, i.e., Library, offices of the Business and Finance division, Computing and Information Systems, Student Personnel Services, International Programs, etc.

During the development of statements of direction by the operating units, administrators in charge of those units were in communication with the Office of the President to determine the propriety of potential unit goals in terms of University priorities, the projected availability of resources which would be required to accomplish the goals, and other factors which would affect the acceptability of the unit's proposal in the total University plan.

Copies of all statements were then distributed among the members of the President's Planning Council for detailed review and analysis. Council members were asked to insure that College and support unit statements were compatible with the University statements and with one another.

Academic Deans were asked to analyze each educational program currently offered in their respective colleges "in adequate detail to ascertain the strengths and weaknesses in programs and their relative positions among like programs in the state system." Of particular concern was the degree of productivity as it related to the cost of the program and the support which the program or its elements offered to other programs in the University. Reports from the deans included the following:

1. A priority classification of present programs for each degree level. (For example, baccalaureate degree programs to be emphasized, programs to remain at present levels, and those to be de-emphasized.)

2. Recommendations as to how present programs should be emphasized or de-emphasized and a proposed time schedule for accomplishing each action.

3. A listing of any new degree programs fitting within the framework of the College which should be added to the programs offered by the University.

4. Recommendations concerning any new program areas which should be explored, which lie in interdisciplinary areas among Colleges, and which might be carried out through some newly developed organizational structure.

5. A tabulation of the number of faculty who might be involved in any action which might be taken to modify programs and the number of sections per year of courses which would be either dropped or added by any action taken.

The following list of considerations was provided to each dean for possible use in determing program priorities:

1. How does the program contribute to the accomplishment of the mission and goals of the university and the college?

2. What is the caliber and what is the reputation of the faculty members assigned to the program? (Examine such matters as: terminal degrees held, publications, the level of recognition in the professional area, proficiency level in terms of assigned tasks, and consulting deman..)

3. Does the program now possess, or will it possess at least a minimum level of resources needed to carry out a particular priority placement? What will be the source of funds?

4. How does the program relate to other programs? Does it have a basic, supportive, or interdisciplinary role?

5. Are there other programs in the State that duplicate the efforts of the program? What are the relative strengths of the other programs?

6. What are the resulting gains and losses in other programs if resources are placed in this program?

7. What is the demand for the product produced by the program, now and in the future?

8. What are the present and future numbers of students taught and graduated at both the undergraduate and/or graduate levels? What is the number of student credit hours taught to students from other program areas?

9. What evidence is available in regard to the quality of the present program?

10. What facilities are available, or would be needed to place the program at a particular priority level?

In the fall of 1972, President Kamm appointed a Steering Committee of the Planning Council, consisting of three vice presidents (including the two who are directly responsible for the three primary functions of the institution), two academic deans, and

the author. The Steering Committee in no way replaces the decision-making function of the total Council. It was felt that a small working group, serving as an instrument of the Council, could provide continuity between regular meetings of the total group, furnish advance thinking and direction, and accomplish some necessary administrative tasks associated with the work of the Council. One of the initial functions of the Steering Committee was to focus its attention on implementation procedures required to effect a continuous planning process within the University.

During the fourth annual planning retreat in February, 1973, the Planning Council adopted an eight-step planning process for the University. The process is designed to be continuous and flexible, and will achieve coordination and interrelation of units, allow inputs from all segments of the University community, relate to budgetary and programmatic units (teaching, research, extension, and support services), allow for evaluation of results, combine the best features of the traditional approach to planning with modern management practice, recognize the University's central concern for people, and permit management objectives to serve as a basis for decision-making. The eight steps in the planning process are as follows:

1. Development of University Objectives

   The president and vice presidents, on an annual basis, will suggest broad guidelines and from three to five areas of high priority for the next fiscal year by category (Teaching, Research, Extension, and Support Services). Additional lower priority objectives may be listed. Following discussion with deans and directors, "final" statements of university objectives for the next year will be prepared.

2. Development of College/Division Objectives

   Deans and division directors will develop objectives compatible with but not limited to those of the vice presidents. Each dean or division director will specify three to five high priority objectives in each major category with which he is involved. Additional lower priority objectives may be listed. These documents will be reviewed with deparment heads prior to "finalization."

3. Development of Departmental Objectives

Each department will develop a list of three to five high priority objectives in those functional categories in which it is involved. These should be compatible with but not limited to those of the college/division. Additional objectives may be listed in an addendum. The budgetary implication of each item should be detailed.

4. Interaction and Finalization of Departmental and College/Division Objectives

Budgetary feasibility as well as compatability of objectives with University mission and goals should be considered.

5. Analysis of College/Division Objectives

Vice Presidents will analyze college/division objectives, which will now include departmental inputs, establish "reconciliation machinery" as needed, review interim progress reports, consider budgetary feasibility, and recommend a plan to the president for approval.

6. Articulation of Approved Plan for the University and its Subdivisions by the President.

7. Operation of the Plan

Individual units will have twelve months in which to accomplish or make progress toward their objectives. Some will be accomplished in a shorter time period.

8. Evaluation of the Results of the Plan

Each unit will prepare an interim evaluation of its successes and failures on a quarterly basis. A "final" report will be due annually. Reports will serve as a basis for formulation of the subsequent year's planning and establishment of guidelines by the president and vice presidents.

An annual schedule for implementation of the University planning process, by steps, is presented in Table 1. Procedures for annual evaluation of progress by faculty members toward individual objectives are now being developed.

At the present time, academic deans are meeting with their faculties, by departments, to provide an overview of the planning process of the University. Faculty members are being asked to review the statements of University mission, planning principles, and goals in terms of what they communicate and what may have been omitted from them. Deans are discussing with the faculty the manner in which they will be involved in the planning process--through the development of departmental-level objectives which will become

Table 1. Calendar for Annual Planning Process at Oklahoma State University

Activity	Leadership	Approximate Time Necessary	Date
1. Development of University Objectives	President and Vice Presidents	1 Month	October
2. Development of College/Division Objectives	Deans/Directors	1 Month	November
3. Development of Departmental Objectives	Department Heads	1 Month	December
4. College/Division - Department Interaction	Deans/Directors	1 Month	January
5. Vice Presidential Analysis and Interaction	Vice Presidents	2 Months	February-March
6. Approval and Articulation of Final Plan	President	----	Approximately April 1
7. Operation of the Plan	All Unit Administrators	12 Months *	July 1-June 30
8. Evaluation of Results	All Unit Administrators	Continual (Quarterly Reports)	1st day of each quarter

* Some objectives will be completed in shorter time; others may be long-term in nature

integral parts of a yearly plan for the University.

Although planning in its present form at Oklahoma State University has not been in progress for a sufficient period of time to permit a valid evaluation of its total effectiveness, administrative officials recognize that it is an essential activity in providing the type of continuous self-renewal which will allow the University to not only be receptive to change and remain relevant in society, but allocate its resources with maximum efficiency in order to maintain its high standards of excellence. Through the in-service management training program of the Planning Council, personnel who will be responsible for University planning are more knowledgable and sophisticated in their approach to it, and communicate with one another in planning terms. An integrated student data system is being developed as one component of a management information system. A reduction in the number of sections offered in certain courses is being accomplished to lessen costs. Planning activity at Oklahoma State University has also been at least partially responsible for the development of an attitude of trust and rapport among the top administrative officers of the University through countless hours of deliberation and frank appraisal, for the establishment of a vehicle for understanding that has enabled the leaders of the institution to effectively deal with critical situations, and for the building of a "oneness" within the academic community whose value cannot be measured in monetary terms.

OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Solomon's observation of many centuries ago has real significance for higher education today: "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

The modern university is vastly more complex, with far greater demands placed upon it, than the university of yesterday. Academic institutions must be creative and innovative, and must demonstrate the necessary courage and foresight to cast off obsolete and costly programs and procedures that have been maintained as burdensome relics because of custom, a sense of tradition, or self-centered aspirations of individuals and groups. Although things of value from the past must obviously be protected, and change merely for the sake of change--change made without examination of its relationship to the mission and goals of the university--is foolhardy, academic institutions must find new ways to rid themselves of millstones. Change must be based on informed judgment, arrived at through careful collection, analysis, and interpretation of institutional data.

Commitment to long-range planning is essential for an academic institution if it is to continue to control, at least in part, its own destiny. A significant portion of the traditional "academic" decision-making process clearly exhibits signs of moving away from academic institutions toward the political arena, particularly in colleges and universities supported largely by state and/or federal funds. Intervention by governmental agencies in the affairs of academic institutions has reached a new high and can probably be expected to climb higher--partly because of a serious and widespread public impression that many colleges and universities have "grown fat," only giving "lip service" to efficiency and effectiveness while shunning the responsibility for wise and prudent utilization of public

resources. Higher education no longer enjoys its former preferential stature in American income distribution. Other areas, i.e., welfare, urban problems, have captured the public attention and moved ahead of higher education on the priority funding scale. Renewed vision and aggressive leadership are required if higher education is to regain its position of eminence in American society.

It is well-established that no university is capable of being "all things to all people" by offering "programs of academic excellence" in all areas. This is particularly obvious in times of fiscal austerity. Through continuous self-evaluation and analysis, institutions can establish a sound basis for distinguishing between academic areas which should be strengthened and those for which funding should be curtailed or discontinued. Identification of institutional strengths and weaknesses is imperative if scarce resources are to be expended with optimum efficiency.

There can be no doubt that the management and administrative requirements of large, multipurpose universities have increased dramatically during the past decade. Obviously, an academic institution cannot and should not be managed like a business corporation. Yet, academic administrators can profit greatly through the utilization of validated business practices that are adaptable to the affairs of their institutions. It is the author's belief that most educational institutions have considerable capacity to reorganize financial resources to achieve greater efficiency without adversely affecting academic standards and goals.

Current social demands for increased accountability can be turned into opportunities for renewed public confidence and increased support by progressive institutions that accept the responsibility for planning and effecting institutional change where it is needed, and

move with consistency and efficiency toward selected goals.

The roles to be played by each of the constituents of the academic community and "publics" to which the university is accountable--by regents, administrators, faculty, students, statewide and/or regional coordinating agencies (if applicable), legislators and other state and federal government officials, alumni, parents, donors, friends, and other citizens--and the interaction of these roles in influencing the basic decision-making processes of the university, particularly in the establishment of institutional goals and objectives, represent questions which each institution must resolve in its own unique manner.

Adversary relationships between academic administrators and faculty, which are unfortunately becoming more intense--and which will be or are being negatively compounded by new kinds of interpersonal relationships fostered through faculty unionization and collective bargaining--further confuse the issue of who will do the planning. In order to be successfully institutionalized, planning must allow for participation and inputs over a broad base--regents, administrators, faculty, students, and others who may be invited to contribute in this manner. Ultimate decisions, however, must be made by those who are directly responsible and held accountable for the direction of the university.

If a university planning effort is to be successful, the plan must recognize that "a university consists of people--faculty and students--engaged in teaching and learning that which is known and in seeking together that which is unknown, striving to achieve those qualities of mind and spirit which give direction and high purpose to life" (Kamm, 1963). Institutional plans occasionally lose sight of the fact that the central purpose of the university is academic. The plan must not be so rigid and fiscally-oriented that it curtails the academic process--which constitutes the very heartbeat of the institution.

Planning is a time-consuming activity. For the pleasures and pressures of teaching, research, and public service, planning can be easily overlooked in the academic community unless time is set aside for it. A planning council, with membership representative of all segments of the institution, can play a key role in revitalizing a university through the establishment of purpose and direction and by setting an institutional plan in motion. The planning process, as well as the plan itself, can do much to bolster institutional spirit and morale by bringing together the segments of the academic community--administrators, faculty, and students--into a close and positive working relationship.

In order for a university plan to achieve maximum effectiveness, it must be as straightforward and uncomplicated as possible. While making optimum use of the principles drawn from modern management theory and practice, the planning process must also utilize the best features of the traditional, "common sense" approach to planning. The plan must not be allowed to "suffocate" due to a lack of simplicity and clarity.

Institutional planning cannot be allowed to become a "one-shot" effort. It must be "built in" as an integral part of the ongoing affairs of any academic community wishing to remain relevant in the future, and it must allow for flexibility. The institution must be able to continually revise its objectives in accordance with changing academic, social, and financial conditions. The planning process is a means to an end. The plan cannot be permitted to become the end product itself.

Finally, the university president must have the commitment, the courage, and the ability to lead the faculty, staff and students in achieving the goals of the university.

Any college or university without an effective mechanism for planning should draw upon the successful patterns provided by others. Various planning techniques and models are available, and can be modified to fit the needs of a particular institution.

For several years, there has been much talk in American academic circles about planning and its virtues. Up to this time, there appears to have been little actually done about it in many universities. Why have so much time and money been spent on institutional planning with so little tangible result except in terms of physical plant facilities? What are the factors that interfere with the implementation of university plans? The basic factor, the author believes, is that few individuals are really willing to "bite the bullet." Practically everyone in the academic community understands, to some extent at least, that widespread cutbacks--in programs, activities, operations, and/or personnel--are inevitable now and in the coming years if institutions are to continue to develop, or even maintain status quo, in their respective areas of academic excellence and potential achievement in light of the anticipated levels of monetary support available to higher education. And yet, segments of the modern academic institution have become so compartmentalized, competitive, and protective of "their own" resources, that administrators and faculty of academic units of the university are reluctant to "give up" financial or physical resources* that are said to be needed for advancement of general university objectives--primarily because the resources are needed for growth and development within that unit, but often partially due to the belief that other units will not also "contribute" proportionally. An attitude characterized by "let someone else give in" is woefully prevalent. Nevertheless, academic administrators must take the necessary actions to insure that their institutions will be operated with maximum efficiency while maintaining standards of academic excellence in the future.

*The author, having served as Interim Dean and as Associate Dean and Director of Research of a growing College within a University, readily concedes that this is a self-"criticism" and not one which is only directed at others. Any dean or director of an academic unit who is worthy of his title, in the author's opinion, struggles to obtain and hold maximum support of all kinds for his faculty and their endeavors. Thus, the "compartmentalization dilemma", which is perhaps even more critical among departments within a college, is a problem which will not be easily resolved.

In order for the university to regain public confidence and survive as a vital force which makes decisions relevant to the problems of today and tomorrow, it has no alternative but to reexamine with commitment its purpose for being and identify, clarify and articulate its mission, goals, and objectives in order to chart its own course and forecast an explicit design for the future. It must continually assess its strengths and weaknesses, evaluate existing practices and restraints, anticipate future trends and evaluate alternative courses of action, formulate board strategies and specific programs for achieving its goals, and determine its priorities. Planning with flexibility for the effective allocation of scarce resources, to include elimination of its activities and expenditures which are inefficient, unproductive, and do not contribute to the realization of its goals, has become an essential university function. The institution should establish and maintain a well-balanced posture with respect to autonomy and accountability, incorporate validated management practices to their optimum advantage while retaining a clear vision of the academic goals of the institution, move consistently toward its goals, and commit itself to a continuous program of self-evaluation and renewal.

University planning: Who needs it? We all do.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Babbidge, Homer D. "Design and Change in American Higher Education." In Long-Range Planning in Higher Education. Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. Boulder, Colo. pp. 1-6. 1965.

Bellows, Everett H. "How Much Change? How Fast?" AGB Reports. 13(5): 21-26. 1971.

Besse, Ralph. "A Comparison of the University with the Corporation." AGB Reports. 15(3): 2-14. 1972.

Bolin, John G. Institutional Long-Range Planning. Institute of Higher Education. University of Georgia. Athens. 36 p. 1969.

Bolton, Earl C. and Fredric H. Genck. "Universities and Management." The Journal of Higher Education. 42(4): 279-291. 1971.

Bowen, Howard R. "Can Higher Education Become More Efficient?" Educational Record. 53(3): 191-200. 1972.

Brown, David G. "Criteria for Pruning Programs." Educational Record. 51(4): 405-409. 1970.

Browne, Arthur D. "The Institution and the System: Autonomy and Coordination." In Long-Range Planning in Higher Education. Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. Boulder, Colo. pp. 39-51. 1965.

Cartter, Allan M. "After Effects of Blind Eye to Telescope." Educational Record. 51(4): 333-338. 1970.

Casasco, Juan A. Planning Techniques for University Management. American Council on Education with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. 77 p. 1970.

Chase, Francis S. "The Status of Educational Planning in the United States." In Educational Planning in the United States. F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc. Itasca, Ill. 1969.

Cheit, Earl F. The New Depression in Higher Education. McGraw-Hill Book Co. for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York. 1971.

Cullen, Matthew. "What Can We Do?" AGB Reports. 13(9): 18-27. 1971.

Dobbins, Charles G. "Change: Why? How? To What?" Educational Record. 52(4): 300. 1971.

Dobbins, Charles G. "An End to the Posture of Defense." Educational Record. 53(1): 4. 1972a.

Dobbins, Charles G. "Strange Contradictions in Higher Education." Educational Record. 53(2): 100. 1972b.

Drucker, Peter F. "Toward a Theory of Organizations." (Part 1). AGB Reports. 15(1): 2-11. 1972.

Eide, Kjell. "The Planning Process." In Educational Planning in the United States. F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc. Itasca, Ill. 1969.

Eurich, Alvin C. "Managing the Future: Some Practical Suggestions." In The Future Academic Community. American Council on Education. Washington, D. C. 1968.

Eurich, Alvin C. and Sidney G. Tickton. Long-Range Planning and Budgeting at Colleges and Universities. Academy for Educational Development. Paper No. 6. 1972.

Fellman, David. "The Academic Community: Who Decides What?" In Whose Goals for American Higher Education? American Council on Education. Washington, D. C. 1968.

Gould, Samuel B. "A New Objective." In Whose Goals for American Higher Education? American Council on Education. Washington, D. C. 1968.

Gould, Samuel B. Today's Academic Condition. McGraw-Hill Book Co. New York. 1970.

Gross, Edward and Paul V. Grambsch. University Goals and Academic Power: A Study in Conflict and Cooperation. American Council on Education. Washington, D. C. 1968.

Harvey, James. "College and University Planning." ERIC/Higher Education Research Reports. September. pp. 22-27. 1971.

Henry, David D. "Accountability: To Whom, For What, By What Means?" Educational Record. 53(4): 287-292. 1972.

Hesburgh, Theodore M. "Resurrection for Higher Education." Educational Record. 53(1): 5-11. 1972.

Heyns, Roger W. "Renewal, Financing, Cooperation: Tasks for Today." Educational Record. 54(1): 32-37. 1973.

Jellema, William W. The Red and the Black: Special Preliminary Report on the Financial Status, Present and Projected, of Private Institutions of Higher Learning. Association of American Colleges. Washington, D. C. 1971.

Kamm, Robert B. "Significant Elements of a University." Oklahoma State Alumnus. January. pp. 8-9. 1963.

McHenry, Dean E. "Planning in the College and University." In Long-Range Planning in Higher Education. Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. Boulder, Colo. pp. 7-13. 1965.

National Laboratory for Higher Education. The Educational Development Officer: Role, Tasks and Training. Durham, North Carolina. 1972.

Neff, Charles B. "Planning and Governance." The Journal of Higher Education. 42(2): 116-132. 1971.

Oswald, John W. "Hard Choices We Must Make." Educational Record. 54(1): 4. 1973.

Palola, Ernest G., Timothy Lehmann and William R. Blischke. "The Reluctant Planner: Faculty in Institutional Planning." The Journal of Higher Education. 42(7): 587-602. 1971.

Perkins, James A. "Higher Education in the 1970's." Educational Record. 51(3): 246-252. 1970.

Perkins, James A. "The Drive for Coordination." In Higher Education: From Autonomy to Systems. International Council for Educational Development. New York. 1972.

Peterson, Richard E. "The Crisis of Purpose: Definition and Uses of Institutional Goals." ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. Report 5. Washington, D. C. October. 15 p. 1970.

Reinert, Paul C. "Reform or Perish." AGB Reports. 15(3): 16-22. 1972.

Smith, Robert G. College and University Planning: Report on a Joint Study by Colgate University and American Foundation for Management Research. Colgate University. Hamilton, New York. January. 71 p. 1969.

Smith, Virginia B. "Colleges and Finances: Ills and Remedies." AGB Reports. 13(7): 4-13. 1971.

Toepfer, Louis A. "The Oppression of Structure and Process." Educational Record. 54(1): 23. 1973.

Uhl, Norman P. "Identifying College Goals the Delphi Way." Administration and Organization: Topical Papers and Reprints No. 2. National Laboratory for Higher Education. 1971.

Wallis, W. Allen. "Institutional Coherence and Priorities." In Whose Goals for American Higher Education? American Council on Education. Washington, D. C. 1968.

Williams, Harry. Planning for Effective Resource Allocation in Universities. American Council on Education. Washington, D. C. 1966.

Wilson, Logan. Shaping American Higher Education. American Council on Education. Washington, D. C. 1971.

Winstead, Philip C. and Edward N. Hobson. "Institutional Goals: Where to from Here?" The Journal of Higher Education. 42(8): 669-677. 1971.